THEOLOGY

VOL. XLIX JANUARY, 1946 No. 307

Editorial

ONE thing we hope the new year may bring is some curtailment of the rhetoric, dear to many ecclesiastics, about the great opportunity that lies before the Church. At the moment this language is used in connexion with flamboyant proposals for the conversion of England. Parts of the Report on Evangelism are in this vein, though other parts are much better. If an opportunity is defined as "a time, juncture, or condition of things favourable to an end or purpose," it should be apparent to anyone who contemplates the condition of the Church, and who has a glimmering sense of what is meant by the secularization of the modern mind, that there is no present opportunity for a sweeping campaign or a large-scale movement. If advertised and launched, it will fall flat, as all the campaigns of this sort have done for a generation and more. Each successive defeat of expectations that never should have been raised leads to deeper frustration and bewilderment.

But because the Church is not confronted by a great opportunity, it does not follow that it is confronted by no opportunity at all. God never leaves His people without an opportunity of obeying His will, or His Church without an opportunity of building up the body of Christ. "In times of peace," said Archbishop Leighton, "the Church may dilate more, and build as it were into breadth; but in times of trouble it arises more in height; it is then built upwards; as in cities, where men are straitened, they build usually higher than in the country." This is a time of trouble, of straitened circumstances, of small opportunities. But the opportunities are none the less real for being small. Very encouraging things are in fact happening in many parishes where the stream of agitated literature that pours from central and diocesan offices goes into the waste-paper basket, and priest and people resolutely and unostentatiously concentrate on learning from the beginning what it is to be a Christian family with the responsibility of witnessing to the Lordship of Christ in their own locality. And it is not only in parishes where a fully developed parish communion and parish meeting can be at once established that there is an opportunity of making the building up of the body of Christ the directive of pastoral work. Nor need the consequence be feared that the Church will thus be turned in upon itself. Quite the contrary ought to happen, and does happen.

Our statesmen, on the other hand, are busy framing and carrying through measures of widespread reform, which incidentally are unlikely to make anything like as much difference to our national life as is expected either by those who favour or by those who fear them. Meanwhile, projects of widespread ecclesiastical reform, in spite of all that has been said and written about them, continue to hang fire. Before very many years have passed, the dearth of human and material

resources will no doubt force reform upon the Church. But it may be that until this pressure becomes more acute very little can be done. The ecclesiastical system may be in such a condition that, however much we would, we cannot anticipate the reconstruction that will prove necessary. If that be so, it is a waste of energy to complain that the Church Assembly is so dilatory and ineffective. Attention should rather be directed to the places where there are always opportunities of co-operating with what, in the end, is God's only enduring design—namely, the building up of the body of Christ. There is no time and no place at which this work cannot go forward.

With every month almost, the shape of things to come in the world that is passing away becomes more inscrutable. Certainly in the political field, whether secular or ecclesiastical, we must act responsibly in such light or twilight as is vouchsafed to us. But it is vain to pretend that we have more light than we have, or that we are provided by God with opportunities which indeed we have done nothing to deserve and should be incapable of turning to good effect even if we had them. God made the moon as well as the sun, and when He does not see fit to grant us the sunlight He means us to guide our steps as well as we can by moonlight. It is not the first time that the future has seemed so incalculable as to forbid magnificent or far-reaching designs. Leighton's contemporary, Thomas Fuller, said: "In all fickle times (such as we live in), it is folly to fix on any durable design, as inconsistent with the uncertainty of our age, and safest to pitch up tent-projects, whose alteration may with less loss, and a clear conscience, comply with the change of the times." The impermanency and unreliability of what is transitory are being underlined day by day in the history of this time. Men who can read that much will not be impressed by a Church that goes on repeating the language of the great opportunity, which may have been plausible after the last war, but is banal now. "True Christianity is a very quiet and deliberate religion. It keeps the steam acting on the wheels, instead of noisily whizzing out at the safety valve" (Archbishop Whately).

The Church in the Dominions and the Church at Home

"Every great question which has agitated the mind of the Church in this country (England) has had, as it were, its previous rehearsal upon the narrow stage of the Colonies." This was the opinion, at the close of his life, of William Grant Broughton, first Bishop of Australia, who died in 1854. He is one of a trio of great bishops to whom the Anglican Communion owes much. Broughton, Selwyn and Gray, Bishops of Australia, New Zealand and Cape Town, were each of them pioneer bishops, true pioneers, true bishops and true statesmen, though Broughton's work has never been recognized in a double-decker biography as has that of the other two. Firmly and wisely they laid the foundations of the Church in the lands to which they were called.

The stage of the Colonies was not only narrow. It was not so cluttered up by precedent and history as that of England and, maybe, that is why the rehearsals took place there. For instance, the agitation regarding "Papal aggression" which raised so much dust in 1850-1 had already been experienced in Sydney five years before. An Archbishop of Sydney and Vicar Apostolic of New Holland was appointed in 1845. Broughton issued a protest, denying the right of the Roman Church to intrude a bishop into the jurisdiction of "a lawful bishop of Australia according to the canons and usages of the Church."[1] Regarding it as an invasion not only of the rights of Canterbury but as an attack on the supremacy of the Crown, he was disappointed that the question was not taken up in England. The oath of supremacy did not seem to be of much use, and after this he advocated that it be abolished in the Colonies.

The questions which have been rehearsed on the Colonial stage are mainly those rooted in the relations of Church and State. Issues inherent in the English situation stand out clearly in the history of the Church in the Dominions. When self-government was granted to the Colonies (in the 1850's) then disestablishment followed, and not unnaturally since the colonists were Scotch and Irish as well as English. The Legislative Council of New South Wales, as early as 1834 (whilst it was still a body nominated by the Governor), placed the Church of England on the same level as other religious bodies in the matter of State assistance. The whole matter was confused, however, by the fact that the bishops held Letters Patent, giving them their power of jurisdiction, even though the feeling was growing amongst some of them that these were not of much value. In June, 1863, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council set their seal to this opinion when, in the case of "Long *v.* the Bishop of Cape Town," they decided that Letters Patent, issued after constitutional government had been established at the Cape, were ineffectual to create jurisdiction in the Colony.[2] After this, no Letters Patent were issued to bishops being consecrated to sees in self-governing colonies. Thus it was made clear that the bishop's authority is not derived from the State—a point popularly forgotten in England of the early nineteenth century. So were the main outlines of the problem of Church and State caused to stand out in perspective in the clearer light of Colonial conditions.

The most striking development in the Church overseas took place in the matter of the laity sharing in the governance of the Church. In this, as in so much else in the constitutional development of the Church, there is a debt, almost unacknowledged, to Gladstone. It was his advice and encouragement which helped Selwyn, who was in this matter the pioneer, at least in the Southern Hemisphere. The matter had been discussed in the diocese of Quebec as far back as 1832, but nothing was done until 1851, when Bishop Strachan organized a Diocesan Synod for his diocese of Toronto.[3] The example of the United

[1] A. E. David, *Australia* (Handbooks of English Church Expansion) (1908), p. 38.
[2] Cecil Lewis and G. E. Edwards, *Historical Records of the Church of the Province of South Africa* (1934), p. 155.
[3] A. N. Bethune, *Memoir of the Revd John Strachan* (1870), pp. 249 *ff.*

States, with its Conventions including laymen, was always before the Church in Canada, and doubtless did much to smooth away difficulties such as Bishop Seabury had felt.[1] Meanwhile, early in 1846 Gladstone wrote to Selwyn, then in his fifth year as Bishop of New Zealand: "Write me fully all you think and feel concerning the wants of the Church under you. I do not mean as to money but as to organization; as to good laws, as to the inward means of strength for the performance of her work; as to giving her a substantive aspect in the face of the State and the public, though a friendly one. My own thoughts turn to the question whether our Churches in the Colonies do not want something in the nature of an organization beginning from below, from each congregation and its members. Whether it is not now a great problem to consider if any and what more definite functions should be given to the laity in Church affairs. Their representation through the Parliament becomes, it is manifest, daily less and less adequate."[2]

At his second "synod" in 1847 (a meeting with his few clergy had been held in 1844) Selwyn laid before the clergy a plan for the definite revival of synodical government. "Our present meeting," he said, "may be looked upon as one of a long series, beginning at the Council of Jerusalem, in which it has been attempted, with very various success, to discover the Will of God by the assembling together of the ministers of Christ for social prayer and mutual counsel."[3] "I believe the monarchical idea of the episcopate to be as foreign to the true mind of the Church, as it is adverse to the Gospel doctrine of humility."[4] The matter was not merely theoretical. There were no precedents or independent rights of the clergy to limit the Colonial bishop. His powers were those of the autocrat, or, with Letters Patent invalid, practically nil. It was urgent to find some way of avoiding either of these extremes by finding some basis for jurisdiction. The organization of synodical government was the answer.

Selwyn, however, realized that more than a clerical synod was desirable. Sir George Grey, the Governor of the Colony, on his sick bed had drawn up a draft of a constitution for the Church in New Zealand, and its chief point was that the laity were to be represented. The idea came from America (he actually used the American term "Convention"), where such government had sprung up in the Church very soon after the end of the War of American Independence. The first General Convention had been held in Philadelphia, September, 1785, when more laymen were present than clergy.[5] Bishop Seabury and his Connecticut clergy were opposed to this introduction of the laity into Synod. The English episcopate too had looked somewhat askance. Selwyn received this draft and expressed his willingness to consider it if it should be supported by churchpeople. The

[1] E. E. Beardsley, *Life of Samuel Seabury* (1884), p. 188.

[2] H. W. Tucker, *Life and Episcopate of George Augustus Selwyn* (1879), i. 217. *Cp.* W. E. Gladstone, *Gleanings of Past Years, 1843-1878*, vol. vi, Essay on "The Function of Laymen in the Church" (London, 1879).

[3] Tucker, *op. cit.*, i. 235.

[4] Tucker, *op. cit.*, i. 246.

[5] Leighton Coleman, *A History of the American Church* (1906), pp. 49*f.* *Cp.* Beardsley, *op. cit.*, pp. 197 *ff.*

Governor secured ninety-four signatures of influential people in New Zealand.

With this document in his pocket, Selwyn went to Sydney for an important meeting of all six Australasian bishops in 1850. Relations of Church and State were still obscure (Letters Patent had not yet been officially discredited) and the meeting, not sure of how far it was "inhibited by the Queen's Supremacy from exercising the powers of an ecclesiastical Synod," did not claim such powers.[1] This was, however, the first effort of the Colonial Church to throw off the shackles of Erastianism and amongst the recommendations was one that Provincial and Diocesan Synods of bishops and clergy, and Conventions of the laity, should be set up. No matter concerning temporalities was to be dealt with without the agreement of the lay convention. So was the first step taken in British possessions to give the laity a direct voice in Church government. Membership of the Convention was to be confined to male communicants, but the electoral qualification was left to the dioceses for their decisions. Actually the dioceses hesitated about adopting these recommendations. Each bishop adopted his own modifications of the scheme. Then too it was feared that the Royal Prerogative might be infringed, and Broughton made the journey to England in order to clear up the point. He died whilst in England (1854).

In Canada too there was at this time again agitation for Synods nearly twenty years after the idea had first been put forward. At Toronto in May, 1851, Bishop Strachan held a Conference of clergy and laity which was a Synod in all but name.[2] On the opposite side of the globe a similar meeting was held at Auckland six months later. Australian and Canadian bishops had been in touch with one another, but the position was not yet clear. Colonial bishops became frequent visitors at the Colonial Office. Short of Adelaide and Perry of Melbourne as well as Selwyn paid visits to England. The first true "Synod" was at Toronto in 1853, the next at Adelaide two years later. Parliament refused to legislate on behalf of the Colonial Church, but the Crown lawyers began to say (1853) that possibly there was no legal obstacle to such Synods and meetings of the clergy. By 1866 most dioceses in self-governing colonies had Synods.[3] Provincial Synods too had appeared. Some dioceses applied to their local legislature for enabling Acts to authorize their organization—so Melbourne and Canada. Most dioceses were only too glad to be free from embarrassing entanglements with the State and based their discipline and organization on "consensual compact," by which all clergy and office holders on taking office voluntarily submit to the rulings of Synod—so Adelaide, New Zealand and South Africa.[4]

In England the movement lagged far behind. A Church Congress was held at Cambridge in 1861 in which clergy and laity together discussed ecclesiastical matters. In 1863 the matter of Diocesan Synods was raised in Convocation. Ely can claim the honour of holding the

[1] Pascoe, *200 Years of the S.P.G.*, p. 760 (S.P.G., 1901).
[2] Bethune, *op. cit.*, pp. 249 *ff.*
[3] H. W. Tucker, *English Church in other Lands* (1886), p. 208.
[4] H. Lowther Clarke, *Constitutional Church Government* (1924), p. 210.

first such meeting (in 1864), and other dioceses began to follow suit, notably Lichfield, under Selwyn, now returned from New Zealand. The disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1869 gave a real impetus to the movement.

Here is the great example of a "rehearsal on the Colonial stage," and it is not of a mere disturbance but of a great reform. The rehearsal took some years to be accepted in England as something which might well be followed. Doubtless this experiment took place in these distant parts of the world because of the greater freedom of action on the part of the Church there. It had been disestablished by the local legislature and the control of the State as represented by Letters Patent was beginning to show signs of weakness. There was, too, a lack of precedent and of the tyranny of history in these new lands. Erastianism was by no means lacking but it was considerably less than in England. Besides this greater freedom there was an urgent demand for action. Month by month the Colonies were expanding in population and in size of settlement. New work had to be undertaken, policies laid down and followed, and for this the co-operation of laymen was a practical and urgent necessity. The laity themselves demanded an active part in Church government. They had to put their hands deeply into their pockets (there was but little, if any, endowment to fall back upon), and not unnaturally they wished to have some say as to the governance of the Church.

Are not these conditions beginning to obtain in England to-day? The Church has gained a limited freedom in the Enabling Act, there is a willingness to break away from precedent which is new, and, above all, the laity are having to contribute a greater proportion of the Church's income. Underlying most of our present perplexities is the great question of Church and State. If change there is to be, it can only be in a direction which will bring us more nearly to the conditions prevailing in the Dominions. We should do well to look to the Church in the Dominions that we may perhaps profit by their experience. Compared with the venerable mother Church of England they may be almost adolescent still, but adolescents, who have been out in the world meeting conditions not experienced at home, may have some good ideas for all their (comparative) youth. Can we afford to neglect any such experience at the present time?

The Dominions too have been faced with the religious education problem. There is a (compromise) system at work in New South Wales and certain other Australian States which works well enough to have been suggested as the solution of our English problem. There is no "dual system." In the State schools religious teaching is confined to "simple Bible teaching," but the clergy of all denominations have the right of entry during school hours at certain specified times for denominational teaching. The teachers are present for disciplinary reasons. The teachers seem to welcome it, the clergy find it satisfactory, and the system has some sixty years of experience to recommend it. At least it is worth while inquiring into its working.

Dire tragedy is forecast by some if the "parson's freehold" is touched. Yet the clergy of New Zealand, for example, have not this safeguard.

Are they then delivered into the hands of the dissatisfied layman and the unsympathetic autocratic bishop, or the bureaucratic clerical committee? The answer to this question could be obtained. There is, in the Dominions, unavoidably owing to the financial conditions, the power of the purse strings wielded by the local congregation. This is guarded against to some extent in some dioceses by a system whereby the parishes pay to a central diocesan fund from which the stipends are paid. But this abuse does not occur often. In any case, whether we will or no, with a greater reliance on the offerings of the faithful laity here, the possibility of this same abuse of the power of the purse has come to the Church of England.

The finances of the Church of England have to be overhauled. The whole question of endowments is involved, complicated as it is by legal issues. On what principles would we organize our endowments if we had a free hand? That question is not beside the point as giving us an aim. In the Dominions there are few endowments, but what there are are often vested in the diocese, not the parish. Nor is the endowment allowed to be for the whole amount of the parson's stipend. Local effort and support there must always be, nor is it lacking.

The Province of Western Australia when it makes a grant to a newly developed parish does so on the principle that the grant lessens year by year as the work becomes established.[1] The Diocese of Adelaide takes a bold line in ordering that no parish can be represented on the Diocesan Synod which has not given its four annual Sunday sermons and collections for home and foreign missions, clergy pensions and clergy widows' pension funds. The parochial quota was in operation in Wellington, New Zealand, and other dioceses, long before it came, a blessing or a curse and yet a necessity, into English Church life. Selwyn's idea that Easter offerings and surplice fees should belong to the diocese is worth noting. This was put into practice in New Zealand and makes it plain that these are dues owing to the Church and not "tips" to individual clergy for services rendered. As the Church of England seeks new ways of financing its work let us keep these things in mind.

It is above all in Church organization that we can gain by the experiments and experience of other parts of our Communion. Our present system of Convocations almost reduplicated by the Church Assembly is clumsy. Yet on what lines should they be organized? How much authority should be invested in the Diocesan Conferences—how much in the Convocations? Should Convocations be amended by the inclusion of representatives of the laity? If we cast our eyes over the oceans to the Church of the Dominions or the Church of America we might gain a sense of perspective to our own problems—and possibly glean some useful information. These Constitutions have not been built up without controversy and error, nor are they so uniform as not to be worthy of study.

We can learn of the overseas Provinces not only by adopting some of their arrangements but by avoiding their mistakes. The question they can help us to answer is, "How does it work in practice?" On the

[1] *World Call—Our Own People Overseas* (Church Assembly, 1927), p. 69.

important point of the appointment of bishops, dioceses adopt various methods. In some the Synod elects, in others the power of selection can be delegated to a small committee, often including the Archbishop of Canterbury and maybe four other bishops. In yet other cases the Bench of Bishops of the Dominion or the Province are given the duty of choosing. One conviction alone seems universal in Australia, and that is "that the English system of nomination by the Crown for formal election by a Dean and Chapter is of all methods most antiquated, Erastian and intolerable." Dioceses which guarantee the income for the bishop, or which remember the raising of the endowment capital, naturally wish to be consulted in the selection of the bishop. But the result has often been, to quote a recent article, "that Provincial Synods, both in Australia and elsewhere, have small knowledge of available leaders, are commonly unwilling to trust themselves to a man of outstanding originality and frequently, for safety's sake, choose a moderate mediocrity of their acquaintance with reversion to an esteemed Archdeacon who, on the next vacancy, 'proceeds' unopposed to the dignity he had missed. Maybe, appointment by a Prime Minister, disciplined by his career, having learnt to be an acute judge of public opinion and making a mistake at his peril, is not such a bad method after all."[1] There is less opening for party wirepulling and electioneering than in other apparently more rational methods based on ecclesiastical freedom. At least let us inquire how this works before we get heated in agitating for reforms.

The question of patronage arises too. In New Zealand, for instance, appointments are made by a Diocesan Board of Nomination consisting of the bishop, a priest elected by the clergy, and a layman elected by the laity. A parish vestry can select from three possible names submitted to it by the Board of Nomination. The system of mixed patronage works moderately well in England, but is not the New Zealand scheme suggestive? When a new benefice comes into being would it be good for the patronage to be handled in some such way rather than simply vested in the bishop? The working of the Church in dioceses overseas might throw some light upon this question.

No longer do we rest content with the all-availing efficacy of the parochial system. Experiments in supplementing it are being made, such as the appointment of factory chaplains. New pastoral methods have had to be developed overseas, too. These may, or may not, give us direct ideas. At the least they can underline the fact that the parochial system may have to be supplemented. The "Sunday School by post" and the Caravan Mission in Canada is a great experiment which has been followed up in Australia by the Bush Church Aid Society. The Railway Mission of South Africa and the Bush Brotherhoods in Australia, each evolved to deal with the problem of thinly populated areas, are suggestive even though we are not faced with such a thin covering of humanity. The lay reader makes possible services in many lonely places in the Dominions. He has an honourable place in

[1] A. G. B. West in *The Quarterly Review*.

the work of the Church and is much more widely used than he is at home. There is a shortage of clergy now and it is likely to grow worse. Many country priests would welcome the help of a lay reader. Might not the experience of the Church overseas underline the witness of the faithful work of English lay readers as to the importance and possibilities of this ministry? The Bush Church Aid Society runs hostels near to country schools, where children from the distant homesteads may board during term-time and live in a Christian home atmosphere.[1] Could something like this be attempted in England when the new country schools, drawing senior children from a wide area, come into being? It might be of more value than a Church school.

We English greatly dislike being called insular. Yet how little aware are we of the daughter nations of the Dominions unless as producers of the necessary bacon or butter or apples! How sad that the majority of English Church people are so unaware of the Church in those same nations. Maybe it is because the "ties" are growing thin. There was a demand at one time for priests to go out to the "Colonies" either as priests or as bishops, but now these lands are largely self-supporting. Men no longer come and go. The experiment of interchange of clergy tried by the Bishop of London in the years before 1914 came to an end with the 1914 war and has never been revived. So the channels by which experience of one part of the Church can pass to another have been restricted almost to vanishing point. The main contact between the Church of England and the Church of the Dominions is at the Lambeth Conference. The work in each country must in the main be done by those who have grown up in it and who call it home, but that does not mean that there is no place for priests and bishops from other Provinces, whether they come for the rest of their lives or even for a period of years only. A "Central Staff College," as suggested by Canon W. F. France, if it could be established, would help greatly in this matter of pooling experience, but it would not do away with the need for a healthy circulation of priests between the various Provinces. And let not the interchange be in one direction only. Let it be true interchange with bishops and priests from other Provinces serving here in England. The Lambeth Conference of 1930[2] felt compelled to reaffirm the principle of discrimination as embodied in the Colonial Clergy Act owing largely to the difference in standards demanded for ordination in the various Provinces. This hinders interchange, but need not forbid it, nor cut it down to its present negligible flow. What an invigorating flow of experience might reach all parts of the Church! Why should not more ordinands be advised to seek a theological college and first curacy in lands overseas, especially if the standards of training could be evened up?

A visitor who travelled South Africa, New Zealand and Australia in the early years of this century criticized the Church of Australia for having been a rather pale imitation of the Church of England for most of the nineteenth century. The men who had gone out as bishops had, with notable exceptions (but what exceptions they were!—Tyrell, Short,

[1] T. E. Jones, *These Twenty Years* (Sydney, 1939), pp. 39-42.
[2] *Encyclical Letter, etc.*, pp. 162 and 167.

Montgomery, to mention but three of many), been those not quite good enough for bishops in England. That seems a harsh judgment, but let it underline the fact that the men who go to the Dominions ought to be, as Archbishop Sumner said, "the élite"[1] and freely given by the Church at home. They need all the qualities that make a good bishop at home, plus the adaptability and "freshness" demanded by life overseas. We need to rethink our scale of values, and to realize afresh that, as Westcott was wont to say, London, Calcutta, Sydney are the three cardinal hinges in the Anglican communion. A see in the Dominions is as much a place of service to God and so of honour as are the time-hallowed sees of Great Britain. It was Lord Lang of Lambeth who, when about to go to York in 1908, said: "The future of the English-speaking world is not with London, but with Canada and Australia. I wonder whether it would not have been better to say I refused the Archbishopric of York in order to take Montreal."

Our conception of the Anglican Communion tends to be pre-Copernican. We see the Churches of South Africa and Canada, of New Zealand and Australia as revolving round the Church of England. Whereas, of course, they are vigorous independent Churches of equal status with the Provinces of Canterbury and York, though yielding them primacy of honour. All alike are planets, though some are smaller than others. The Church of England is rich in tradition and numbers and pelf maybe, but they are not without their riches of youthful vigour and of experience of working under conditions in many ways similar to those to which we are moving. Let us try to see things aright. Let us not be unwilling to learn from these young offshoots of the Church at home.

In opening the General Synod of Australia in 1886 Bishop Barry (who, be it noted, was appointed to Sydney virtually by Lambeth) said: "There can be no reason why this Synod should not express its deliberate opinion, in the name of the branch of our Church which it does represent, communicating that opinion for consideration by Synodical authority in England; submitting it, if it be thought well, to the great Council of the whole Anglican Communion gathered at Lambeth. In such initiative there is no presumption. If we are as yet far from being able to approach to any equality in richness of learning, ability and authority with the Church of the old country, yet there are circumstances in our experience here which not only force great questions rapidly upon us, but may perhaps not infrequently suggest their solution. There are legal complications and embarrassments, connected with the relation to the State, from which we are free, and perhaps it may be sometimes well that the risk of initiative be taken by the lesser bodies, while the weightier authority of the greater is reserved for thoughtful judgment and final determination."[2] Let us match this attitude by abandoning any ecclesiastical isolationism and drawing upon the experience of other Provinces than those of Canterbury and York.

G. T. Berwick.

Crosby Ravensworth Vicarage, Penrith.

[1] H. W. Tucker, *Memoir of Edward Feild* (1876), p. 125.
[2] F. J. Whittington, *Augustus Short, First Bishop of Adelaide* (1888).

Baptism and the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament

THE article "Baptism with Water and with the Holy Ghost"[1] very properly calls attention to the unity of what may be termed the "Baptism-Confirmation" experience, as it is presented in the New Testament. But it is by no means clear from the New Testament evidence that the Western practice of postponing Confirmation can be supported on the ground that the gift of the Holy Spirit is necessarily to be associated with a "responsible adult experience." It is difficult to think of the conversion (in the N.T. sense) of those who from birth have enjoyed the benefits and privileges of a Christian environment, although at some time or other there must be a deliberate and responsible submission to Christ. This may be regarded, however, rather as the consequence of the activity of the indwelling Spirit than as the occasion of His being given—which prompts the query: Can the fact of the Holy Spirit's indwelling justifiably be denied on the ground of a subjective unconsciousness (as with the infant) of that indwelling? The separation of Confirmation from Baptism is nothing more than an accident of history, and it is not surprising that attempts to justify this accident theologically have proved neither convincing nor consistent. Such an anomalous position has never arisen in the East, though there the "confirmation" rite differs from the Western in matter, form, and minister; it may therefore be worth while to re-examine some of the familiar evidence, in an attempt to discover precisely what the N.T. writers conceive to be the relation between Baptism and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The integral connexion between water-baptism and Spirit-baptism is indicated, not only by the use of *βαπτίζω* in both cases (Mark i, 8; Matt. iii, 11; Luke iii, 16; *cf.* John i, 26 and 33), but by the saying of Jesus to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii, 5). "The earthy, human action is met and established—it is not superseded—by the corresponding baptism from above and of the Spirit" (Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, i. 246). It seems clear that Christian initiation was conceived by Jesus and by the Evangelists as consisting, not of two separate and distinct rites, but of a single and indissoluble rite of water-and-Spirit baptism, and this finds support in the Pauline writings. In Rom. v, 5 the love of God is said to have been "poured out" (R.V. less accurately, "shed abroad") through the gift of the Spirit. Here *ἐκκέχυται* has "baptismal" associations (*cf.* Tit. iii, 6), while in other contexts it is used directly of the outpouring of the Spirit (Acts ii, 33; x, 45; *cf.* Joel ii, 28-29 [iii, 1-2], and the parallel thought, differently expressed in LXX, of Isa. xxxii, 15 and xliv, 3). The "baptismal" metaphor lends weight to the idea that the Spirit was thought of as given simultaneously with the act of baptism. So commenting on 1 Cor. xii, 13, "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body (*cf.* Gal. iii, 28) . . . and were all made to drink of one Spirit," Thornton observes that " 'in one Spirit' suggests that to be dipped in the bap-

[1] In THEOLOGY, November, 1945.

tismal water is to be dipped in the Spirit" (*The Common Life in the Body of Christ*, p. 93). And in connexion with 1 Cor. vi, 11, ". . . but ye were washed [R.V.m. 'washed yourselves'], but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God," he notes that the repeated aorists demonstrate that "all these verbs refer to the same event" (*ibid.*, p. 87), and concludes that "the double event described in Romans v, 5 took place at baptism, or at least had its inception there" (*ibid.*, p. 88). It is from this conclusion that Tit. iii, 6 and Heb. vi, 2 must be approached: in both cases it seems legitimate to conclude that the reference is to the single act of water-and-Spirit baptism.

So with Jesus' own baptism, unique though it was: He "was baptized of John in the Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, He saw . . . the Spirit as a dove descending upon Him . . ." (Mark i, 9-10). But when we turn to examine the initiations mentioned in Acts, we find that the evidence is conflicting. It may be summarized as follows:

1. In one case (ii, 38) the gift of the Spirit is expressly stated to be a direct (and immediate?) consequence of baptism.
2. In one case (the Samaritans, viii, 9 f.) the gift of the Spirit is not given as a result of baptism in the name of Jesus, but is conferred later by apostolic imposition of hands.
3. In one case (the Ethiopian, viii, 26 f.) there is uncertainty on textual grounds. The "Western" addition: Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον is generally rejected; there is no evidence whether the Spirit was given by direct descent, or not at all.
4. In three cases (Lydia, xvi, 15, the jailor and his household, xvi, 33, many Corinthians, xviii, 8) converts are baptized but no mention is made of the Holy Spirit or of imposition of hands.
5. In one case (Cornelius, x) the Spirit is given extraordinarily, and subsequent baptism regularizes the situation.
6. In one case (Apollos, xviii, 24 f.) of baptism by John, no re-baptism and no laying-on of hands is recorded, but there is evidence of possession by the Spirit (though no specific reference to Him).
7. In one group of "about twelve" cases at Ephesus (xix, 1-7) of baptisms by John, re-baptism (voluntary?) takes place, with imposition of hands, by which the Holy Spirit is given.
8. In one case (Paul, ix, 17-18) a laying-on of hands precedes baptism, but there is no indication whether this was for the restoration of Paul's sight (when this case must be added to those mentioned under 4) or for the conferring of the Holy Spirit.

In two cases only is the Spirit given by imposition of hands, and it is to these that appeal is usually made when Confirmation is under discussion. But what of the others? It is sometimes alleged that in those early days conditions were too abnormal for the initiations in Acts to be used as reliable evidence, but this is not entirely satisfactory. Why was not Apollos rebaptized and "confirmed" like the other twelve disciples of John? Does silence upon the point justify our concluding that Lydia, the jailor, and the Corinthian converts (and the

Ethiopian?) either did not receive the Spirit or were later "confirmed" by apostolic imposition of hands? It can hardly be argued from later practice that although in any one particular case no imposition of hands is mentioned, it *must* nevertheless have taken place. Spirit-baptism might be mediated by insufflation (John xx, 22—though presumably this is exceptional), by the apostolic laying-on of hands, or by direct descent or outpouring. The one constant feature of Christian initiation, as described in these early records, is the water-baptism, either by immersion or submersion, or by affusion as symbolic of submersion.[1] We may conclude that when no mention is made of laying-on of hands, the gift of the Spirit was by a direct descent, as at Pentecost—and that this was perhaps the normal experience, the cases of the Samaritans and the disciples of John being exceptional, and therefore specially mentioned.

We pass to the significance of Spirit-baptism. Clearly it is messianic; it is the baptism given by the Coming One whose way it was John's task to prepare. The water-baptism remains (uniting the Jewish idea of ritual purification preparatory to approaching the Torah and the Holy God, the Hellenistic idea of cleansing from moral uncleanness and experience of dying and rebirth [see exx. in Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch z. N.T.*, i. 528-9], and the distinctively Johannine idea of repentance with confession for the remission of sins), but the Spirit-baptism confers upon it a new and unique character. The disciples saw in the event of Pentecost a fulfilment of the messianic prophecy of Joel: "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh" (ii, 28; *cf.* Isa. xxxii, 15; xliv, 3; also Num. xi, 29). In view of the unique relation between the Messiah and His people (the Church being the Body of which He is the Head) the gifts promised to Him pass over to them: "wisdom and understanding . . . counsel and might . . . knowledge and fear of the Lord." It is through the instrumentality of the Church that Christ now works out His purpose of righteousness (Isa. xi, 2 f.) and proclaims the good tidings of the advent of the new age, and the "day of vengeance" of God (Isa. lxi, 1 *f.*). It was upon the messianic community that the Spirit was first outpoured; it is in the community that He abides; it is the community which He is guiding into all the truth. And it is upon the individual at his initiation as a member of the redeemed community that the messianic gift of the Spirit is outpoured; the Spirit-baptism must be understood primarily with reference to the Church, rather than to the religious life of the individual. This truth is obscured when Confirmation is separated from Baptism, by which the individual is incorporated into the mystical Body. The term "ordination of the laity" is not suitable, but the *Report*, in advocating it, displays a correct perception of the "enabling" function of the gift of the Spirit in relation to the part which the individual member of Christ, be he cleric or layman, is called upon to play in the total action of the Body. This emphasis is much to be preferred to the in-

[1] For archæological evidence against the practice of immersion (*c.* A.D. 100 onwards) see C. F. Rogers, *Baptism and Christian Archæology*. H. G. Marsh, in *The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism* (1941), favours immersion as the primitive practice, pp. 74 *f.*, 168 *f.*

dividualistic one which associates the outpouring of the Spirit principally with the bestowal of the "fruit of the Spirit" (Gal. v, 22-23). That "fruit" is rather the evidence of His continual indwelling. Neither water-baptism nor Spirit-baptism can be understood properly *merely* in terms of individual regeneration and sanctification; they derive their primary significance from the context in which alone they can be administered.

Christian initiation, in the New Testament, is ordinarily understood as a single event, a new birth of "water and the Spirit." This event involves two distinct but nevertheless indissolubly connected features, a water-baptism and a Spirit-baptism or outpouring of the Holy Ghost, generally by direct descent, sometimes through imposition of hands. No later developments (such as the general practice of episcopal laying-on of hands in the West, or the substitution for this of chrism in the East), and no later accretions, can affect the fact that the New Testament contains no justification for the separation of Confirmation from Baptism, or for associating the gift of the Spirit in its plenitude with the former. The Evangelists, like St Paul, bear witness to the essential unity of water-and-Spirit baptism, without which none can "enter into the kingdom of God." It is beyond the scope of this examination to inquire how the Church can now so resolve the attendant practical problems as to resume its effective witness to this essential unity. Those problems are necessarily very great, but not insuperable. The bishop, for instance, would presumably have to be associated with the minister of baptism in any rite which followed the Eastern principle of administering "confirmation" immediately after baptism, and an enlargement of the episcopate might be the only alternative to some limited delegation of authority. Serious consideration might well be given to the introduction of crismation. Only a child of baptized and fully practising parents could be baptized in infancy; he would be admitted to the Communion as soon as he had received simple instruction in its meaning, and on attaining years of discretion (sixteen to nineteen?) would be required to make a solemn and public affirmation of the baptismal vows, after a full preparation and instruction in the Faith. In other cases, if baptism were desired, it would have to be preceded, in the case of parents who were lapsed or "nominal" Christians, by an appropriate preparation and the public act of affirmation and re-dedication, and, in the case of non-Christian parents, by a proper catechumenate and water-and-Spirit baptism—a reversion to the primitive baptism of households, in effect. The doctrinal position would be clarified, and many of the present abuses obviated, and Christian initiation would regain something of its former impressiveness. The existence of serious practical difficulties ought not, in any case, to prevent recognition of the nature of Christian initiation as it is described in the New Testament.

Sherwin Bailey.

Edinburgh.

Studies in Texts

SONS OR SERVANTS? A NOTE ON LUKE XV, 11-END

". . . make me one of thy hired servants" (Luke xv, 19).

In the index to *The Parables of the Kingdom*[1] "the Prodigal Son" is included in the list of "parables discussed in detail." Prof. Dodd's treatment of it is surprisingly meagre, viz.:

> Its point would seem to lie in the contrast between the delight of a father at the return of his scapegrace son and the "churlish" attitude of the "respectable" elder brother. The application, however, is to the same situation (as Luke xv, 1-10) in the ministry of Jesus. So Luke represents it, and we cannot doubt that he is right.[2]

That situation, of concern for the depressed classes of the Jewish community, is undeniably suitable, as is also the general interpretation as showing God's unprecedented concern for the "lost."[3] The question remains: Is it adequate? Dr Dodd's only other reference to this, one of the greatest of the parables, is to class it with the other longer parables as *Novellen*, on the basis of Bultmann's classification.[4] These longer, elaborate, parables raise again the question whether the detail is added for sheer joy of story-telling or whether it is significant.

No one wishes to defend the recently discredited method of allegory. Yet the over-simplification of Jülicher's treatment is unsatisfactory. The case for an inner affinity between the natural and the spiritual order, expressed in the parables, is nowhere argued more powerfully than by the author already cited. It is therefore all the more surprising to find that he gives such a slight treatment of the parable in question. A careful study of the parable yields a rich harvest, with ramifications in every important aspect of the Christian Faith. This is surely no fortuitous result; it is sounder to ask whether it be not the natural intention of the Author of the parable.

Pursuing this, on the grounds already laid down by Prof. Dodd,[5] it is readily seen that, if there be a real affinity between the natural and spiritual—under the special conditions of the parables (see below)—there will occur lesser and greater degrees of congruity with spiritual reality, inherent in the subject-matter. A parable like the one in question approximates in its main features to the fundamental situation in which men are placed in the perspective of Jesus. The details, consequently, may well be important. To those who respond to Him, God is "Abba, Father," together with all the intimate relatedness that that essentially Christian form of address to God implies.

The parables of Jesus are word-pictures, painted by a master. Just as a good portrait painter sees his subject in his own way, so Jesus sees what we call ordinary everyday events, in human life and nature, in His own way; He sees them as God sees them, and gives His interpretation of their real character. Because He is a true *poietes*, a master at His craft, we can find in His word-pictures the mind of God. It is

[1] C. H. Dodd, 1935, p. 211. [2] and [3] *Ibid.*, p. 120. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[5] In the first chapter of the book already cited.

essential that a portrait painter bring out what is there already in the character of the sitter. Likewise, there is to be no suggestion that Jesus reads into human experience the beauty of His own mind; on the contrary, He brings out what is there already: "The Kingdom of God is come upon you"—it is found here by Jesus, and at the same time brought out and set in operation by Him. In a special sense He is *autobasileia*: the place where the "kingdom" comes alive.

All this must be borne in mind when considering the "Sitz im Leben" of any particular parable. Moreover, a parable such as "the Prodigal Son"—*i.e.*, one of the *Novellen*—has a wide range of possible situations, proportionate to the degree in which it implies the actual situation of mankind before God. The choice of subject in this case makes the parable capable of bearing and evoking a meaning the richness of which rivals the Pattern Prayer itself, the most systematic piece of teaching Jesus ever gave. It is claimed here that "the Prodigal Son" is the only serious competitor with the "Lord's Prayer" for that status. The interpretation set out below is not intended to be exhaustive, but as it differs in its main point or "form" from the usual interpretations, the discussion will be concentrated on that.

The text quoted leads to the following interpretation, summarized briefly as follows: In the Divine counsel all men are called to be God's sons, but in practice they will do anything to avoid this, preferring to be His servants either in name or in fact. Over against this the Father can but hope to evoke sonhood by His fatherly love.

The advantage of this general interpretation lies in the cogency it gives to the later section dealing with the Elder Son—a section which some have thought to be unnecessary, owing to their obsession by the popular title. Beginning, then, with the Elder Son, he is presented as one who, though living always with his father, and, in principle, possessing all that his father has, still behaves towards his parent as though he were a master. He never dreams of *asking* his father for a kid. He never has the wit to exercise his sonship and take one. He is a near relation of the man who buried his talent. He is, in fact, a hired servant. Like many "good living" people, he never lives at all. He possesses, for purposes of "Sitz im Leben," a strong family resemblance to the Pharisee. He does his work and he expects his "father" to pay him. And hired labour always assumes some time off, even under the Jewish law! There is no thought of utter self-giving or of a status like sonhood, which can never be revoked. He has *earned* his status, he reckons, and is envious of the generous treatment handed out to "that fellow," who is, after all, his brother. The man, he considers, has forfeited his sonhood. Hasn't he had his share of the patrimony? Here the point comes to the surface: it is patrimony, not the *pater*, which counts. In consequence the elder brother had never entered into his true heritage, and we are not told whether he responded to his father's appeal. In the nature of the case, one cannot know: not even the father knows whether the son will or will not accept sonhood of himself (*cf.* Matt. xi, 27).

Several enticing lines of thought open out here, but it is necessary to turn to the main opening section and examine the case of the Prodigal.

It is usually assumed that the words "he came to himself" imply deep contrition. This is not necessary. Indeed, the words and train of thought suggest that the scamp, although greatly chastened, decided to go back to the old man for what he could get—viz., decent provender as an hired servant. He is willing to give up his sonhood—which, in any case, he thinks himself to have forfeited, especially as he has lost his patrimony. In some MSS, as he addresses his father, he is interrupted before he can get out the words of shame.[1] Instead, the father clearly shows that sonhood cannot be cast away; that all its privileges, and responsibilities, are waiting for the Prodigal. Try as he will he cannot get out of it. The father will accept no part-time service as substitute for the responsibility of being a son. He, the father, will face the future with him; what does the patrimony matter? "For this my son was dead, and is alive again, was lost and is found."

Here again a son attempts, partly from repentance, partly from self-interest, to jettison his sonhood for the part-time advantages of a hired servant. His real sin is to think he can reject his sonhood and be a servant in his father's house. The elder brother *was* in effect a hired servant; the Prodigal, by his candour, mistaken as it was, was able to begin to enter into true sonhood. Behind the whole action lies the character and activity of the father. The popular title of the parable is already known to be misleading; if the above argument is sound, a new name for the story must be found. A suggestion may be made by using the father's words "was dead and is alive again," together with the crucial words "my son." Jesus often uses the words "dead" and "alive" to discriminate between men. Both sons were dead, and wanting to be, or actually functioning as, hired servants. Therein lay their "deadness." In terms of a later, less living, theology, the gross sinner found grace, while his righteous elder brother lay in the darkness of "law." Both share the error of treating their relation to their father as a business relation. The whole parable is a profound indictment, by implication, of the whole Jewish system. At this point it casts light upon, and is lit up by, the Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard. This common element provides a convenient tail-piece to this study.

The Elder Son's envy condemns him outright, because possession of the "Kingdom of Heaven," being in the Father's house and sharing His rule, is a privilege which does not rest upon exclusiveness as such —though few there be that find it. It is its own reward and its own utter satisfaction. If the elder boy had really lived in his father's house, he would, like his father, have rejoiced that his brother was truly "alive." Here is the point of overlapping with the great Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard. They all receive a penny—however long they work. The real reward is in working in God's vineyard: to work there with Him (whether it be half-an-hour or a day, makes no difference), that is the thing.

It is surely, then, better to call this great doctrinal parable by some title such as "The Sons who were Servants," or "who tried to be Servants," and if a logion is required as a tail-piece to the parable why

[1] In the "Reich" Text, curiously enough. It usually conflates. Latin and Syriac versions support the omission. The great MSS B ℵ D repeat the phrase.

not use "only the Son knows the Father"?[1] Luke's choice of setting brings out well one of the major elements in the parable; to seek another is idle, not because Luke's is adequate, but because this parable is worthy of Mark's words on the Sower—"His Doctrine."[2]

J. E. YATES.

MANCHESTER.

CORRESPONDENCE

"THE BISHOPS AND THE WAR"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I am deeply sensitive to the honour done to me by your editorial treatment of my letter on the above subject; but there is one remark in your defence of the bishops which calls for comment. You say: "in order to test this impression we have read through all the published utterances and debates on various aspects of the war in the *Chronicle of the Convocation of Canterbury* since the beginning of 1940; and it has been thereby confirmed." Have you, though, studied with equal care the speeches of bishops in the House of Lords and their letters in Diocesan Chronicles? For it is among *these*, I think, that the utterances I so much deplore have been made. This, however, is but a single thrust. My real contention was that "to do nothing in particular and do it very well" may be admirable in secular diplomacy on occasions; but is to be deplored when it is the policy of Christian bishops in a great and terrible moral crisis.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

31, HARRINGTON GARDENS, S.W.7.

[No; we have not studied the speeches of the bishops in the House of Lords or their letters in Diocesan Chronicles. We propose to leave that labour to someone who is prepared to proceed from a general charge to particular documentation. We studied the *Chronicle of Convocation* (*a*) because it happened to be accessible, and (*b*) because Mr Sampson in his original letter referred to Convocation, whereas he made no allusion to the House of Lords or Diocesan Chronicles. In any case, it seems to us that he tends to confuse the office of a bishop with the calling of a prophet.—ED. THEOLOGY.]

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Though I have not followed your example and read through the war debates in the *Chronicle* of Canterbury Convocation I was present at the sessions of the Lower House during the years of war, and a general result disengages itself from that experience.

Convocation had before the war been interested in possible relations with the Church in Finland. In 1940 we passed a resolution of sympathy with the people and Church of Finland "suffering under the cruel aggression of Soviet Russia." This coincided with what was

[1] Matt. xi, 27; Luke x, 22. [2] Mark iv, 2.

generally felt in England at that time. But by 1942 English public opinion had veered about. Accordingly we were invited in Convocation to express "hope and confidence that . . . the Russian and the British nations will go forward together to bring in a new age of . . . brotherhood and of mutual service among all men and all nations." This was almost accepted in the Lower House, but fortunately the debate was adjourned to the next session, and then the Dean of Canterbury told us that he had been discussing the matter with M. Maisky. It appeared that any resolution—except indeed one urging an attack on the Western Front—would make a bad impression on M. Maisky's mind. So the Lower House promptly passed the Previous Question, though it did not follow M. Maisky's suggestion of a resolution about the Western Front.

Not only Finland had been the subject of our interest and approach before the war. We also had reports and discussions about the Church in the other Baltic Republics. Russia wiped those states out: the English public was not much interested in their fate; and Convocation had no word of regret for its extinguished friends.

Mr Sampson puts the bishops in the forefront of his charge. Is that quite fair? Putting aside the fact, with its various consequences, that the bishops have been appointed by the State, and the rarity of Beckets and Gores in nature, is not his challenge really to a characteristic of the English Church, which the late Archbishop once called "adorably English"—though some of us would substitute another adverb? The Church—bishops, priests, laity—is seldom found on the side opposed to popular opinions and sympathies. Can we claim that in the war it has been, as against propaganda, detached, just, insistent on understanding an enemy's cause, bringing into notice all that is good and humane in him, and as severe on our allies—as in the instance of the circumstances of the use of the atomic bomb, with its grave suspicion of being influenced by colour bar disdain—as on enemies?

We find the acquiescent temper all through our official life, vitiating the Church's witness and in the long run bringing it into disregard. As an example in another sphere, how nervous the Church Assembly is about anything in measures or motions which may not please the Government. What a craven silence it kept in the Tithe Act business ten years ago. In sixteen years of membership of the Assembly I have never known it other than timid and tame to the State.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

W. R. Johnson.

The Rectory,
St Ervan, Cornwall.

"PROSPECT FOR CHRISTENDOM"

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

May I thank you very sincerely for giving me the opportunity of making a brief reply to Mr Reckitt's letter. First may I express my surprise at reading his last paragraph? The nine words I quoted from

the Bishop of Derby's criticisms were taken, not from a letter read, but from a typescript copy of the letter handed out amongst other documents to all and sundry, without any indication being given that the letter was to be treated as private and confidential. However, for the apparent misunderstanding about the nature of the meeting I must apologize. My apologies are also due to Mr Reckitt and those other contributors to his volume whom I did not mention by name. It was unfortunate that you asked me to review this book, as to do adequate justice to each of sixteen contributors in a short review is beyond my very limited powers. In the interests of the cause, which both Mr Reckitt and I wish to advance to the best of our ability, I chose to concentrate on what I cannot help regarding as a serious and dangerous error in a school of thought to which I am deeply indebted. Feeling that previous critics may have misrepresented the Group with regard to this error, I have, by kind invitation, regularly attended their meetings for three years in order to make myself better acquainted with their position and approach and to avoid misrepresenting their views.

I hoped that the undue space I gave to my criticisms would make the issues between us clear. Unfortunately, refusing "a fruitful discussion of Christian sociological issues," Mr Reckitt has ignored every argument I advanced to show where and why I am forced to differ from his Group, and has devoted his long letter to a complete misrepresentation of the views I have always held and of the issues between us. As I took care to make explicitly clear in the review, I share a spiritual attitude to the land and also his Group's opposition to any policy which would lead to soil erosion. The soil to me is a living manifestation of God, and as one who believes that the purpose of agriculture is to feed the people I condemn outright any policy which would make the land incapable of feeding the people. A study of economics leads to many blind spots, but it does at least make one vividly aware that the building up of capital resources must take precedence over the claims of immediate consumption. By the phrase "the soil is made for man" I no more meant that man has no duties to the soil than Christ, when He said, "the Sabbath is made for man," meant that man has no duties to the Sabbath. The point was that our obligations to the soil have to be balanced against various obligations to our fellow-men. Also, far from desiring to "depopulate the countryside," I am an enthusiastic advocate of moving overcrowded people into country towns, believing for many different reasons that this will bring new vitality and new prosperity into rural regions. I am forced, however, to believe that a planned direction of "footloose" industry into country towns as advocated by the Town and Country Planning Association, or to be more specific by its Chairman, Mr F. J. Osborn, is from almost every point of view superior to the method advocated by leading members of the Christendom Group—namely, a policy of self-sufficiency in agriculture. Such a policy ignores the dilemma to which I referred in the review and which is partly expressed in words of the *Economist*, October 21, 1944: "British agriculture has a clear choice between being large and being prosperous, and will obviously be well advised to choose the latter." Again, far from wishing to "deny

to the countryman any rights to his own way of living," I desire nothing more than a policy which will make it possible for more people to live in the country and for farmers to pay a wage which will enable them to maintain an adequate and contented labour force. My concern with efficiency is not in any way due to a worship of "quantitative values," but simply to a realization that on the efficiency of our productive methods depends our family life, the size and health of the family, whether the wife has also to go out to work, and also our ability to overcome the evils of squalor, ignorance, disease, and want. As for suggesting that I would "cheerfully see the rural worker redundant" I can merely say that there is no problem to which I have given greater thought than the avoidance of the tragedy of unemployment, and my desire to serve the countryman's best interests is not one whit less than Mr Reckitt's. Space unfortunately does not permit me to defend myself against such stupidities as the assertion that the difference between us is that I accept the modern world at its own valuation and Mr Reckitt does not.

Those of us whom a study of economics has forced into disagreement with Mr Reckitt's Group have almost despaired of ever getting them to face our criticisms instead of seeking the escapism of personal abuse and misrepresentation. Perhaps I can indicate where the difference in our approach lies by saying that we believe that a crucial factor in determining the right policy for agriculture in the next few years will be whether or not America maintains full employment, a factor which will largely determine the possibilities and nature of international trade. The approach of the Christendom Group leads them to ignore such a factor in their discussions, as they have ignored the dilemma to which I have referred in the review. As I have said, we too are striving to see that the countryman gets a fairer deal and that soil fertility is maintained, but of the various policies for attaining these ends we believe that we must support that which will at the same time promote "the highest good of the whole." In other words, the policy must be one which will enable our limited resources to go as far as possible towards meeting the pressing needs of our fellow-men throughout the world, so many of whom are ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-clothed. We must, therefore, give the closest consideration to the widespread and varied repercussions on all men of any policy we advocate, and it is our contention that the discipline of economics reveals important repercussions easily and often overlooked by those who do not accept this discipline, and also that it is only by making ourselves aware of all ascertainable repercussions that we can acquire the data necessary to decide what is the right policy for us to advocate as Christians. Our complaint is that the absence of this discipline in the approach of the Christendom Group leads to their giving Christian sanctions to policies with which, in the light of fuller data made available by economists, we often find ourselves forced to disagree. We do believe that "at this point of history" the science of economics is such that the closest acquaintance with it is imperative for any Christian body which wishes to make responsible pronouncements on social reconstruction. Our dispute is not about Christian principles, but about whether the appli-

cation of those principles can be a right one when all available data are not considered and when one ignores the science which reveals which ends are compatible and which are mutually exclusive.

For any abuse contained in my review I sincerely apologize, and may I express the wish that any future developments in this controversy will be conducted with a scrupulous refusal to indulge in personal rancour and a concentration on what I have once again indicated as being the real issues at stake. Since we have so much in common surely it is possible, and our Christian duty, to face our differences and yet to "speak the truth in love."

Yours sincerely,
ERIC W. BREWIN.

"BAPTISM WITH WATER AND WITH THE HOLY GHOST"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Many parish priests will be grateful to you for opening the pages of THEOLOGY to the pressing question of Baptism. May I ask two questions in connexion with Mr Moule's article in your November number?

(1) Luke i, 15 tells us that St John the Baptist "shall be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb." Does not this throw some light on the question of infant baptism? To be filled with the Holy Ghost even before birth seems to suggest that the Holy Ghost has ways and means to reach the soul of an infant, which do not require his *conscious* response to God's act. Is not the least in the kingdom of heaven to be accounted greater than John?

(2) Have the findings of the conference mentioned by the writer been published? Will they be available to the public?

Yours sincerely,
JOHN PERRET.

STANTON FITZWARREN RECTORY,
HIGHWORTH, WILTS.
November 9, 1945.

The Rev. C. F. D. Moule writes:

(1) There is no denying that God seems to bestow special privileges on some people, in a way which is beyond their own control, and which may appear arbitrary; and I take it that to say that a child will be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb is a way of saying that he will be exceptionally endowed from the start. Indeed, I explicitly said that I saw no harm in using even the term "regeneration" for a process which sets the child in Christian surroundings before he can consciously respond—provided only that this is not confused with the adult and conscious experience, for which I still believe the Bible reserves the term.

I freely admit, however, that one would not speak of (let us say) protoplasm being filled with the Holy Ghost, and St Luke i, 15 is a passage which tends to depersonalize the working of the Spirit more than many other passages in the N.T. Nothing is gained, I believe, by denying that there are different levels of understanding discernible in the N.T. writings.

(2) The findings are not published, but the Secretary, Evangelical Fellowship for Theological Literature (Doran Court, Reigate Road, Redhill, Surrey), would doubtless be willing to answer inquiries.

BOOK REVIEWS

Religious Experience. A Public Lecture delivered in the Hall of Oriel College by C. C. J. Webb, sometime Oriel Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion in the University of Oxford. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.

This lecture, with a short account of his work and a biography of his writings, is presented to the author on the occasion of his eightieth birthday. He was only a year younger when he delivered it. The list of presenters testifies to the width of his influence, and the lecture to the unimpaired force and weight of his mind.

Dr Webb defends the philosophy of religious experience against the far too facile criticisms it receives from a younger generation. All that he has to say is true and just. The school never meant by experience crude sensation or emotion, but the whole response to reality of a reasonable mind. It took "experience"—that is, the human datum—as its starting-point; and where else can the philosopher start? The divine initiative is prior in fact, but our response is prior for philosophical knowledge; and it is ours, always coloured by subjectivity and never exempt from philosophical scrutiny. If the school spoke of *religious* experience, it did so to take the widest ground, religion in general; not to deny that a narrower ground of Christian experience would sustain a firmer and a loftier edifice. Christian experience is not mere religious experience, but it still is religious, and its unique importance must be shown from within the religious sphere: it can neither be assumed (in philosophy, anyhow) nor proved by purely external criteria.

All this is reasonable enough, but the really sore point has not been touched. Philosophers of religious experience do not mean to deny its objectivity. No, but they have been so acutely aware of the subjective element that they have hardly had the nerve to discriminate real differences in the divine acts experienced. They can tell us that the one Divine impresses diverse minds diversely through diverse things, that the several responses differ infinitely in elevation, fineness, adequacy, and that all these differences are divinely willed. But surely the Christian faith must live or die with the confidence that it can distinguish not only how God chooses that His acts should affect us, but what His acts are. Everything is God's action and from His initiative, that goes without saying. But can we discriminate His acts by way of nature from His supernatural acts? Through nature He makes Himself known as the cause of existence, the ground of conscience, the light of understanding and the master of destiny, as the Good to whom adoration and obedience are owed. The love responsive to this scale of divine acts can bear no full analogy to the love one man has for another; there is not affinity enough. It is otherwise if, by a supernatural act, God exalts us where by nature we cannot stand, to a participation in the love between the Persons in the Blessed Trinity. This exaltation requires the death of the creature. We have foretastes of it before death, but without the consummation of which they are the foretastes they would be nothing.

We know these two sorts of divine action to be different because they signify their differences to us. We call the events which reveal the higher sort supernatural revelation or revelation *par excellence* because of what they reveal. They are, in fact, particular historical events, but this is not (as Dr Webb appears to suggest) the reason for distinguishing them as *par excellence* "revelation." Supernatural revelation requires such means, but neither they nor any other empirical marks make it supernatural revelation. It just is so that in the events of the Christian dispensation we find its central, authentic, and grounded manifestation. Can the philosophy of religious experience make these distinctions? If so, well and good. If not, Christian faith will find it an insufficient mansion.

AUSTIN FARRER.

OXFORD.

TIMOTHY REES OF MIRFIELD AND LLANDAFF. Compiled and edited by J. L. Rees. Mowbrays. 5s.

Ecclesiastical biography serves two main purposes: it may exhibit around some striking character various aspects of the Church's contemporary life and spirituality, or it may exhibit that character itself as an example to other leaders and to all seekers after God. Judged under these two aspects, Chancellor Rees's memoir must be pronounced successful and satisfying. Timothy Rees's ministry touched life at many points: he is still remembered in the mining town where he held his only curacy; he was on the staff of two theological colleges; he was a member of the then youthful Community of the Resurrection; he conducted many missions in England and his native Wales, in New Zealand and Ceylon; he was a chaplain in the 1914-18 war; he was bishop of a great industrial diocese at a time of economic depression and spiritual development; he was closely involved with the I.C.F., with Toc H, with the National Eisteddfod of Wales, and other movements. To exhibit the character of such a many-sided man, the best material would be his own letters; but Timothy's numerous friendships were carried on orally for the most part—though the few letters of his which are in this volume are perhaps the brightest things in it. Chancellor Rees has compensated for the absence of letters by collecting contributions from not less than thirty-three writers, among whom he himself, an elder brother by twelve years, can look back farthest, and Father Richard Barnes, a colleague at Mirfield for twenty-five years, can cover the longest period. Throughout the testimony, certain qualities keep appearing—the faith, the enthusiasm (those eyes and that voice!), the self-discipline, the mounting eloquence in two languages, the charity, the humanity, the humility. The characteristics run steadily through the whole. Those who remember Bishop Rees in later years pleading for the uniting of catholic and evangelical virtues will see that this was no passing phase when they find him saying in 1905: "We are discovering, or beginning to discover, that the Catholic is very high and dry when he is devoid of all Evangelical fervour, and the Evangelical is very narrow and very shallow when divorced from the Catholic order." His unnumbered friends and admirers will be

grateful for a book which places on record so many sides of a life and character of which his closest companions could see only a part; and they will hope that the Chancellor's plan of publishing some of the Bishop's compositions in prose and verse may be fulfilled.

EDWARD SWANSEA AND BRECON.

THE CHURCH AND LEADERSHIP. By F. R. Barry, Bishop of Southwell. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

There is so much in this book which is excellent, and put with a refreshing vigour of style, that the task of the reviewer is made difficult, for to point out its weaknesses might give a false impression of the value of the book; yet there are in this reviewer's estimate inconsistencies and weaknesses which it would be improper to ignore.

In his preface Dr Barry writes: "Now, if ever, the Church throughout the world must assume its rightful place of leadership." There are other places in the book where it seems that he accepts that functional view of the Church—that it exists to serve the world—which many are being driven to think has been perhaps the greatest single barrier to good theology, true evangelicism, and sound social thinking in modern times. On the other hand the Bishop writes: " . . . the Church of God is the goal of history," and it would seem that he is not unaware that when the Church has *sought* to lead the world the results have been disastrous. The need for leadership in the world is beyond doubt, but the Church's leadership is a by-product of its own proper life, which cannot be obtained if it is sought for its own sake.

The Church is "the goal of history," for mankind only achieves the purpose for which it was created in so far as it becomes the Church of God, the Body of Christ, the family of our heavenly Father. It is his fear of a narrow ecclesiasticism, which ignores the sovereignty of God over the affairs of secular life, which is responsible for the flavour of a functional view of the Church in some of the things Dr Barry says. But surely any adequate view of the Church as "the goal of history"—an end in life itself—necessarily implies the drawing of the whole complex of human life, personal, social and economic, to the altar, where it may be conjoined with the one acceptable worship—the sacrificial offering of the Only Son. I am inclined to think that Dr Barry would agree, but he writes of ". . . . demonstrating the relevance of worship to the common life," when much that he says leads to the opinion that he would have been truer to his deepest convictions had he written of demonstrating the relevance of the common life to worship. It is most refreshing to find a diocesan bishop writing: "Theology is the crying need of our time. All the live problems of our time run back into questions of theology," but we are left in doubt as to whether his own theology of the Church is fully articulate.

While being appreciative of current strains in theological thinking, the Bishop thinks that the revolt from liberalism is in part responsible for the lack of contact between Christian thinking and the lives of ordinary people. In my experience, however, many of those, whom he

would on theological grounds condemn for an undiscriminating anti-liberalism, are in fact in closer contact with the life and thought of the secular world than most of the heirs of the liberal tradition.

It would appear from his chapter on "Leadership in Worship" that the author has not yet digested *The Shape of the Liturgy*, and though the chapter contains some points of value its main argument seems to miss the more important issues. The earlier chapters "To Interpret Our Time," "The Church and the World," "Church and Nation," "Clergy and People," and "Leadership in Thought" contain much ripe wisdom.

Michael Bruce.
Chiddingfold.

Paul a Bondslave. By Hugh Ross Williamson. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

This is a straightforward attempt to provide in dramatic version simply the bare bones of the narrative of St Paul's very adventurous career. Perhaps some of us had grown, from our experience of "The Man born to be King," to expect almost too much light to be thrown upon the Biblical story by a rendering in dramatic form. This series of plays is a very much simpler affair. It narrates without any attempt at throwing light on the psychological problems that surround St Paul. The writer has stuck conscientiously to historical as opposed to fanciful scenes, and the result is sometimes pedestrian. The book remains a story and does not become a play; for there is an absence, on the whole, of characterization of the smaller parts. Relief is provided, however, from time to time by the quite entertaining wrangles of St Paul's immediate entourage.

The writer has shown skilful craftsmanship rather than imagination in his use of quotations from St Paul's letters. It would not be true to call this dramatically a success; but perhaps it is useful Christian propaganda and is a way of once again familiarizing people with the greater events in the Biblical story. But I did not feel, when I had reached the end of the play, that I really knew the Apostle any better than before, or had gained any added light on his character or difficulties, for the reader does not derive from the play a clear picture of the hero. It would be hard to render the Onesimus event in any way that was not moving, and certainly a success is scored in this scene.

The style of the conversation among St Paul's immediate friends is so slick that it just doesn't come off. Clearly the event of great importance in his life is the appeal to Cæsar, but in this play it does not come as sufficiently a climax. Radio drama, one might have expected, would have been the ideal medium for scenes from the voyage to Rome, but Mr Ross Williamson seems to have lost a great opportunity. The general impression is left, after reading the book, that it is slight, not profound.

If a reprint is called for, may misprints be corrected on pages 25, 105, 119 and 138?

R. G. Lunt.
Liverpool College.

Selected Poems. By G. Every, J. D. C. Pellow and S. L. Bethell. King and Staples. 6s.

The three poets represented in this volume have this in common, that they are Christians. That in itself is significant. In the 1930's it was the Communists who were selling their artistic wares under one cover. We recall *New Signatures* and *New Country* and many others. It is good to see the Christian forces take the field, but they should do so with a little more verve and a little less conscious orthodoxy.

Social disintegration and the acids of modernity scared our 1920 poets and inclined them to paddle in shallow waters; their verse lacked religious and philosophical conviction; hence many of their successors turned left towards Moscow for inspiration. That source is now less attractive. But playing about in verse with religious dogmas can be just as tedious as playing about with political slogans. In the pulpit the poet's voice becomes rather flat, and in this volume there are too many pulpit poems. We should like a new petition inserted in the Litany, "that it may please Thee to teach our modern poets to sing." J. D. C. Pellow has some good things in this volume, but nothing except a special revelation will persuade us that the following lines are poetry:

> There is no escaping
> the mountain, immutable reality
> for unreality is a part of reality
> time an abstraction of eternity,
> and the desert also
> belongs to the nature of things.

By what criterion are we to judge modern poetry? Milton tells us that poetry should be "simple, sensuous and passionate." Many of the poems in this volume are not simple but complicated; not sensuous but abstract; not passionate but self-conscious. There are too many echoes: echoes of Donne, echoes of Eliot, and again echoes of Eliot. The technique of contrast skilfully used by Eliot in "The Waste Land" can easily become a rather annoying trick (*e.g.*, in Bethell's The March of Mind). Printers' poems abound, by which we mean poems whose structure is made evident not by the ear but only to the eye. And here let us lodge a protest against catalogue poems. If I write

> Two chops, a meat safe, the refrigerator,
> A boiling kettle, saucepans, cups and plates,

it is evident I have a kitchen or scullery in mind, but it is not necessarily a poetic description of that apartment.

Perhaps we have been too hard on this poetic trinity, but in this realm the standard must needs be exacting; a moderately good poem is not worth reading. This volume is a sign rather than an achievement. It holds a promise that the rains may come. Let them come.

W. D. L. Greer.

Westcott House,
Cambridge.

RELIGIOUS RESISTANCE IN HOLLAND. By H. J. Boas. Allen and Unwin. 2s. 6d.

This little book contains a very well documented account of the activities of all branches of the Church in Holland in defence of Christian principles during the period of occupation. As early as October, 1940, the Reformed Churches sent a joint declaration to the Reich Commissioner protesting against anti-semitic measures, and an equally strong line was soon taken by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Mr Boas points out that anti-semitism is particularly repugnant to Calvinists, whose ethics are so largely inspired by veneration for the Old Testament. Many of the Dutch Jews were descendants of men who had fled from Spanish persecution, and formed a highly respected element in Dutch society.

The opposition of Dutch Christians to the German authorities was by no means confined to the defence of their own interests, though they naturally resented the abolition of confessional trade unions and the disfavour shown to religious education. The Church authorities gave strong support to the refusal of Dutch doctors to become members of the "Physicians' Chamber" which practised sterilization and in other respects violated medical standards of conduct. In February, 1943, the Protestant and Roman Catholic leaders issued a joint protest which was read in all churches against "the imposition of a conception of life and of the world that is contradictory to the Gospel of Jesus Christ." The insincerity of the German claim to be the defenders of Christian principles against atheistic Bolshevism was fully recognized.

So prominent was the part played by religious bodies in opposition to the occupying power that the practice of wearing small crosses spread from Roman Catholics to Protestants and to many patriots who belonged to no religious denomination.

Mr Boas quotes a description of Dutch Protestantism before the war as "pastor-centred, largely receptive, often theologically divided and very bourgeois. If ever a Church needed a great shock to be awakened, it was this Church." When the shock came the Dutch Protestants certainly awoke and joined wholeheartedly with Roman Catholics in the defence of Christian principles.

G. H. STEVENSON.

OXFORD.

UNITY AND REUNION: A BIBLIOGRAPHY. By Henry R. T. Brandreth. Adam and Charles Black. 12s. 6d.

With the great schism in the eleventh century "the emphasis . . . shifted from the dissident individual to the dissident community, and the problem of reunion is no longer seen as that of reconciling individuals to the Church from which they have lapsed, but rather as that of bringing communities once more into a state of harmony." Efforts towards that end are of two kinds, aiming respectively at co-operative activity and doctrinal agreement. Each needs the other, and the two cannot be kept apart, but Mr Brandreth rightly sees that the fundamental problems of reunion are in the second of these two fields. Hence

his bibliography is concerned with the literature of what is known as "Faith and Order."

It is prefaced by a brief introduction sketching reunion movements of the nineteenth century as they affect Great Britain. Then comes the classified list of 1,181 publications and indexes of authors and subjects. Where necessary, brief notes give a description of contents. These are quite admirable; with impartial objectivity they tell just what one needs to know. I have no exhaustive knowledge of the literature of the subject; all I can say is that wherever I have tested this book within the limits of my knowledge I have found it, with one exception, both adequate and accurate. The one exception is the omission from the Introduction and the Subject Index of any mention of the World Council of Churches, now in process of formation. This hardly affects the bibliography, but in the Introduction it renders incomplete Mr Brandreth's history of the Faith and Order Movement, and injures his picture of the present situation by leaving out one of its most important features.

In personally investigating and cataloguing nearly 1,200 publications Mr Brandreth has clearly put an immense amount of work into this book. Both he and his publishers deserve the gratitude of all who are concerned about the divisions of Christendom. They have given us an invaluable and indispensable work of reference.

LEONARD HODGSON.

OXFORD.

CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE. By William Robinson. James Clarke. 2s.

ECONOMICS, ETHICS AND STIPENDS. By Thomas Downie. William Blackwood. 2s. 6d.

A PRESENT FOR THE VICAR. By P. M. Barry. Mowbray. 2s. 6d.

These three books have this in common, that they are all of concern to the parish priest.

Prof. Robinson will help him in his preparation of couples for marriage. It is surely for him rather than for them that this book is directly intended, for those who would be capable of digesting it, if it were put into their hands, will be very few and far between. But indeed it may be doubted whether the practice of dealing out literature on these occasions is particularly profitable. Something altogether more personal is required and it is the great merit of this book that it provides the right approach. It is biblical, theological, Christian. It will teach the Christian minister to differentiate himself and his function from that of the marriage guidance bureau, and it may well lead some of us who have been engaged in the task of preparing people for marriage to rethink the lines along which we have been undertaking it. Prof. Robinson's more detailed conclusions and advice will command less universal assent. It is not altogether easy to reconcile the intransigent witness to the permanence of the marriage bond on page 22 with the footnote on page 21 which tells us that "what has to be done in each individual case, where marriage has become a failure, then

becomes a matter of pastoral discipline." But Prof. Robinson will confer on those who read him the benefit of bringing them face to face with the deep things of Christian marriage. That can be said of few among the spate of small books that have appeared on this subject. Two delightful quotations from Jeremy Taylor adorn the opening.

Economics, Ethics and Stipends applies to the conditions of the Kirk the sort of ideas and proposals with which we have been made familiar in *Men, Money and the Ministry* and *Putting our House in Order*. It is perhaps a little comforting to find another established Church faced with economic anomalies so similar to our own and to observe that our much maligned Church Assembly seems in some respects to be further forward in getting to grips with them than is its counterpart. After a preliminary historical survey Mr Downie puts forward his proposals clearly and persuasively. In English discussions of the subject it has frequently been argued that, if present-day contributions were swept into a common pool, the incentive to giving provided by local interest would be removed. Mr Downie makes the interesting suggestion that parishes should be allowed to increase their own ministers' stipends beyond the standard rate and allowances provided that they contribute a corresponding sum to central funds for the assistance of less well-circumstanced parishes. He does not share that attitude towards clerical marriage and the children of the manse which led *The First Book of the Discipline* to describe ministers as "burdened" with wife and children, and which is sometimes the reaction to Mr Quiverful of those who most loudly urge all and sundry to be fruitful and multiply.

Mr Barry's book contains much sound sense on the ordering of services and kindred subjects. He is perhaps inclined to exaggerate the obtuseness of his fellow-clergy, but there are few of us who would not benefit by undergoing his good-natured castigation. We do not think that on page 30 he means to depreciate the body or to exclude it from the offering of ourselves which we make to God, but it is a pity that this might seem to be suggested.

FRANK BENNETT.

NESTON.

THE WAR AND THE VATICAN. By Camille M. Cianfarra. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 10s. 6d.

To say that the peculiar position of the Papacy in wartime is not universally understood is to be guilty of an under-statement. "It is difficult to remember one single word from the Pope in condemnation of the Nazis when they swept London with destruction," the Bishop of Chelmsford wrote in his diocesan magazine in September, 1944. The doubtless well-meant attempt to teach the Holy See its business was as superfluous as it was typical. As early as August, 1940, Pius XII exhorted the belligerent nations to avoid the indiscriminate bombing of civilians. English ignorance and an English propensity to judge in ignorance have been matched by incomprehension in Germany. While a prisoner of war in Bavaria in 1941, I read an Italian journalist's pre-war book on the achievements and aims of National Socialism on its own soil. He pointed out that the German Government, having

given Roman Catholics a concordat and the exercise of a number of freedoms, was entitled to a tangible return in the form of a generous interpretation of the phrase "the things that are Cæsar's." The crudity of German diplomacy on too many occasions could hardly be more strikingly exemplified.

The truth is, of course, that the Holy See during the war was on a sticky wicket. On the one hand, it had already condemned, and was bound to go on condemning, all doctrines according to which the individual owes to the State an allegiance of both body and soul, and it could not witness unmoved the obliteration of one papist country—Poland—and the overrunning of another—Belgium. But, on the other hand, it owed consideration to the patriotism of its many faithful in the Axis countries, and it had recently won from the hands of Italian Fascism a valuable recognition of its claim to temporal sovereignty. Moreover, it was well aware of how variously the Augustinian thesis of the just war may be understood. Altogether, though there is no ground for supposing that it ever missed a chance of preaching the Christian virtues, a day-to-day account of its endeavours to keep a more or less straight bat could not fail to be of the highest interest.

Till the United States and Italy took up arms against each other, Mr Cianfarra was a correspondent in Rome of the *New York Times*. He had excellent opportunities of observing the Vatican in play. Unfortunately, he is not the man to report the batting in book form. That his vocabulary does not invariably conform to the best American usage may be of little moment. It is more serious that he is much preoccupied with personal trivialities, thinks it necessary to supply a biography of the Pope (mentioning that His Holiness shaves himself with an electric razor bought in America), pauses to make pencil sketches of Balbo, Badoglio, and others, and insists on analysing Mussolini's pre-war policy. For the consequence is that, in a volume of 329 pages, the fateful September 1, 1939, is not reached till page 187. Nor after that is anything set down that can do more than attract the political student superficially. Mr Cianfarra remarks that "the Italian *rapprochement* with the Soviet (in 1940, after a previous support of Finland) shows Mussolini's lack of all moral principles." To anyone recalling Roosevelt's eulogy of Mannerheim in 1939 and the embarking by Britain and France in March, 1940, of an expeditionary force for Finland, the words have an unconscious irony. They afford a fair sample of their author's not entirely guileless simplicity.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

PETERBOROUGH.

FROM A HOSTEL VERANDA IN BENGAL. By W. H. G. Holmes. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

Father Holmes gives us some vivid pictures of the people among whom the Oxford Mission works in Calcutta. Viscount Halifax commends the book in these words, "the stories illustrate the grave difficulties with which missionary work in India has to contend—the servitude of caste, the power of family influence upon an intending

convert, the rival and picturesque claims of terrorism upon the young student, and the subtler force of 'Brahmo Samaj.' It is impossible to read Father Holmes' book without reflecting that the wonder is not that conversions to Christianity are so few, but that they are so many. In face of discouragement, failure, and every kind of obstacle the work goes on. No one realizes better than the Oxford Brotherhood that if India is to be won to Christianity, missionaries must be without any sense of racial superiority. They must practise the humility they preach. They must prove in their own persons the truth that 'whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all'" (p. 5). Priests at home will find here encouragement and wisdom for their work in our largely post-Christian England. S. M. GIBBARD, S.S.J.E.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

BEREAN PRESS: William Robinson, *The Shattered Cross* (2s. 6d.).

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: Arnold Lunn, *The Third Day* (10s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: H. Burn-Murdoch, *Church, Continuity and Unity* (15s.); V. H. H. Green, *Bishop Reginald Pecock* (12s. 6d.).

CHARITY ORGANIZATION SOCIETY: *The New Era* (Loch Memorial Lectures, 1945) (1s.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: T. G. Edwards, *The Guest Chamber* (2s. 6d.).

CHURCH LITERATURE ASSOCIATION: R. Raynes, C.R., *The Church of India, Burma and Ceylon and the South India Scheme* (9d.).

JAMES CLARKE: E. Lampert, *N. Berdyaev;* D. R. Davies, *Reinhold Niebuhr;* D. Attwater, *Eric Gill;* F. A. Lea, *G. K. Chesterton;* N. Macnicol, *C. F. Andrews* (4s. 6d. each).

CLOISTER PRESS (Louisville, U.S.A.): G. R. Elliott, *Church, College and Nation* ($2.00).

ELLISON HAWKS (Southport): Ellison Hawks, *What shall I do after the War?* (7s. 6d.). "The object of this book is to assist men and women now serving in the Forces, or engaged on war work, to select suitable careers."

HEINEMANN: L. Martindale, *The Prevention of Venereal Disease* (2s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: R. E. D. Clarke, *Scientific Rationalism and Christian Faith* (2s.).

LAMBETH MISSION (2/2, Chester Way, S.E.11): Thomas Tiplady, *New Hymns of Praise for Youth Rallies* (5s. per 100, post free).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: F. W. Dillistone, *The Significance of the Cross* (12s. 6d.); Gordon Rupp, *Martin Luther: Hitler's Cause—or Cure?* (3s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: A. E. Taylor, *Does God Exist?* (7s. 6d.).

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION: T. Wigley, *Christianity and the Modern Need—a Modernist Approach* (6d.).

MOWBRAY: W. H. G. Holmes, *From a Hostel Veranda in Bengal* (3s. 6d.); J. H. Ward, *The Sunday Gospels*, 2s. 6d.); Sybil Harton, *Following Christ* (5s. 6d.); J. C. Whitebrook, *The Consecration of Matthew Parker* (8s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: J. Baillie, *What is Christian Civilization?* (2s. 6d.).

S.C.M. Press: F. Greeves, *The Christian Way* (6s.); C. R. Cook, *The State and Ourselves Tomorrow* (2s. 6d.); *People Matter* (6s.); W. M. McGregor, *The Making of a Preacher* (3s. 6d.); *The Land, the People and the Churches* (2s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: M. L. Cozens, *Handbook of Heresies* (5s.); J. Maritain, *The Twilight of Civilization* (3s. 6d.); G. Vann, O.P., *The Divine Pity* (8s. 6d.); D. J. B. Hawkins, *The Criticism of Experience* (5s.).

S.P.C.K.: C. M. Duncan-Jones, *Church History* (Unto a Full Grown Man, vol. v) (3s.); A. R. Vidler, *The Orb and the Cross* (12s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: L. Dalton, *The Early Church and its Worship* (1s.); H. Balmforth, *The Christian Religion* (4s.); H. A. S. Pink, *Learning to Pray with the Church* (9d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher